



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,170	02/18/2004	James W. Cornett	2003P02869US01	1812
Elsa Keller SIEMENS CORPORATION Intellectual Property Dept. 170 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830				
7550 01/03/2012				
EXAMINER				
BENOIT, ESTHER				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2453				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/03/2012		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/781,170

**Applicant(s)**

CORNETT ET AL.

**Examiner**

ESTHER BENOIT

**Art Unit**

2453

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-8,10-24 and 26-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-8,10-24 and 26-29 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CIB-08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendments***

1. This Action is in response to an Amendment filed on October 13, 2011. Claims 1 and 27-29 have been amended. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-24, and 26-29 are pending in this application.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments, see Remarks, filed October 13, 2011, have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Baker, Jr. (US 7,058,693 B1).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 7-8, 10-24, and 26-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cornett et al. (US 7,890,212 B2), in view of Baker, Jr. (US 7,058,693 B1).

**With respect to claim 1**, Cornett discloses a method for configuring a network interface device from an information device communicating with the network interface device via a network (Figure 2 and Col. 4, lines 19-26, *configuring position module from a PC*), the network interface device adaptable to connect a programmable logic controller to a network (Col. 5, lines 51-57, *position module connected to PLC*)

- automatically enforcing, via a wizard at the information device, user compliance with a plurality of predetermined steps for a computer-assisted configuration of the network interface device (Figure 2 and Col. 6, lines 8-19, *wizard to configure position module*)
- providing at least one setting to the network interface device from the information device via the network (Col. 6, lines 8-19, *downloaded configuration to position module*)
- receiving a setting of a logical position of the network interface device relative to the programmable logic controller (Col. 10, lines 42-57, *Q address*).

Cornett does not explicitly teach:

- the computer-assisted configuration relating to an OSI transport layer or above, and
- operating a programmable logic controller on a network via the configured OSI transport layer or above (Col. 5, lines 55-57, where Position Module

and PLC are connected for communication via the Internet. The Internet operates on the OSI transport layer

However, Baker, Jr. discloses:

- the computer-assisted configuration relating to an OSI transport layer or above (Col. 4, lines 47-61, *controlling PLC using web server*), and
- operating a programmable logic controller on a network via the configured OSI transport layer or above ((Col. 4, lines 47-61, *controlling PLC using web server*)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cornett with the teachings of Baker to communicate with and control the PLC through a web server, *because* it will allow for remote configuration of the PLC.

**With respect to claims 27-29**, the limitations of claims 27-29 are similar to the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, the claims are rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 above. Please see rejection.

**With respect to claim 2**, Cornett discloses requesting, from a user, the at least one setting for the network interface device (Col. 10, lines 42-57)

**With respect to claim 3**, Cornett discloses receiving the at least one setting for the network interface device (Col. 10, lines 42-57)

**With respect to claim 7**, Cornett discloses determining the at least one setting for the network interface device (Col. 10, lines 42-57)

**With respect to claim 8**, Cornett discloses configuring the network interface device with the at least one setting (Col. 10, lines 42-57)

**With respect to claim 10**, Cornett discloses receiving a Q-address used by an input/output module attached to the programmable logic controller, the input/output module further coupleable to the network interface device (Col. 10, lines 42-57)

**With respect to claim 11**, Cornett discloses verifying the at least one setting for the network interface device (Col. 11, lines 10-21)

**With respect to claim 12**, Cornett discloses wherein the network interface device is adaptable to communicatively couple the programmable logic controller to an Ethernet network (Col. 5, lines 12-23)

**With respect to claim 13**, Cornett discloses wherein the network interface device is adaptable to communicatively couple the programmable logic controller to the Internet (Col. 5, lines 51-57)

**With respect to claims 14-24**, Cornett does not explicitly disclose the predetermined steps are adaptable for the functions listed.

However, the word “adaptable”, in its ordinary meaning, is defined as “capable of being” or “able to adjust”. The plurality of predetermined steps of these claims are capable of being or able to adjust using the program that is user defined, wherein, the

program found in Baker, Jr. teaches the program for use with these technologies (Col. 5, lines 6-46)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cornett with the teachings of Baker, Jr. to provide a program for customized functions, *because* it will allow for users to define different capabilities for configuring a device.

**With respect to claim 26**, Cornett discloses wherein said plurality of predetermined steps comprises a help utility (Col. 4, lines 41-49)

5. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cornett et al. (US 7,890,212 B2), in view of Baker, Jr. (US 7,058,693 B1), and further in view of Mattson et al. (US 5,983,269).

**With respect to claim 5**, Cornett and Baker, Jr. do not explicitly disclose receiving a count of network connections for the network interface device

However, Mattson discloses receiving a count of network connections for the network interface device (Figure 8)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cornett and Baker, Jr. with the teachings of Mattson to provide a count of network connections, *because* it will allow for topological information regarding the network and the device to be obtained.

**With respect to claim 6**, Cornett and Baker, Jr. do not explicitly disclose receiving a type for at least one network connection to the network interface device

However, Mattson discloses receiving a type for at least one network connection to the network interface device (Figure 8)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Cornett and Baker, Jr. with the teachings of Mattson to provide a type of network connections, *because* it will allow for topological information regarding the network and the device to be obtained.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of



the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Esther Benoit whose telephone number is 571-270-3807. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday between 7:30 a.m and 5 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Krista M. Zele can be reached on 571-272-7288. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

E.B.  
December 21, 2011

/Krista M. Zele/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2453

Application/Control Number: 10/781,170  
Art Unit: 2453

Page 9